REMARKS

This letter is responsive to the office action dated March 20, 2007.

A clerical error in paragraph [0031] is being corrected in this reply.

Claim 4 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 5, and claim 7 has been amended to be dependent on claim 4 and to incorporate the limitations of claim 8. Claims 5 and 8 are cancelled, without prejudice. The claim references in dependent claims 6, 9, 10 and 11 have been amended accordingly.

Each of the claims that remain in the application require the canceling of a detection of a rotation downward of a thumbwheel if detection of a depressible input movement of the thumbwheel occurs within a predetermined time threshold of detection of the rotation downward. The Examiner states in paragraph 4 of the office action that this combination of features is disclosed in US 20020063684 A1 ("Tran"). We respectfully disagree.

In order for the subject matter of the independent claims to be anticipated by Tran, Tran must disclose all of the following:
(a) detection of a rotation downward of a thumbwheel;
(b) detection of a depressible input movement of the thumbwheel; and
(c) cancellation of (a) if (b) occurs within a predetermined time threshold of (a).

Tran discloses (a), but does not explicitly disclose (b). Tran refers to imparting *rotation* to the roller throughout, but does not explicitly teach that the roller can be depressed. However, even if Tran were deemed to disclose (b), Tran clearly does not disclose (c) – i.e. cancellation of a detection of a rotation downward. The corresponding paragraphs cited by the Examiner (i.e. page 1, paragraph 14, lines 1-5) do not disclose cancellation of a detection of a rotation

downward. In fact, Tran does not disclose the cancellation of detected signals resulting from manipulations of the roller, under any circumstances. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) in view of Tran is respectfully requested.

At paragraph 5 of the office action, the Examiner states that the subject matter of claims 7-11 (prior to amendment) are anticipated in view of US 20030076292 A1 ("Griffin"). Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of amended claim 4. Griffin does not disclose the cancellation of a detection of a rotation downward. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) in view of Griffin is respectfully requested.

It would also be erroneous to suggest that the subject matter claimed by the Applicant is obvious in view of Tran, whether taken alone, or in combination with another reference such as Griffin, for example. The techniques disclosed in Tran are clearly different from those taught by the Applicant, and are directed to a different problem.

Tran is generally directed to a technique that detects how "urgently" a user is rotating a roller. Presumably, an action in an application (e.g. scrolling through a list of names in an address book) on a communication device can be accelerated depending on how urgently the user is rotating the roller (see e.g. Tran, [0005]-[0006]). To determine the degree of "rotation urgency", the time between two consecutive rotation events ("roller strokes") is calculated. Rotation urgency is defined as the inverse function of the time lapsed between two consecutive roller strokes. Accordingly, if the time between two consecutive roller strokes is greater than a certain threshold, than the degree of rotation urgency associated with those rolling actions will be lower than if the time between two consecutive roller strokes was less than the threshold (see e.g. Tran, [0021], [0023]). Put another way, the faster the user provides successive

rolling actions, the more urgent the rotation may be deemed. Multiple thresholds can also be defined, so that different levels of urgency can be determined (see e.g. Tran, [0023]-[0024]).

In Tran, the user is consciously performing successive rolling actions in an attempt to speed up a certain action. However, Tran is not directed to a technique to deal with rolling actions of the user that are deemed to be inadvertent. Moreover, Tran is not directed to a technique where the detection of one signal is cancelled (e.g. ignored) if it occurs too close to the detection of another.

In the Applicant's devices and methods, if a rotation downward is detected, and a depressible input movement is detected (e.g. pushing the thumbwheel in), and if the time between the detection of these two inputs occur within a threshold, then the detection of the rotation downward is cancelled (e.g. ignored). Accordingly, the problem with a user inadvertently rolling a thumbwheel down while pushing the thumbwheel inwards is addressed (see throughout Applicant's specification, e.g., paragraphs [0002], [0028]).

The cited references, taken alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest the canceling of a detection of a rotation downward of a thumbwheel if detection of a depressible input movement of said thumbwheel occurs within a predetermined time threshold of detection of said rotation downward. Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing clarifications, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-11 are in form for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Bereskin & Parr
Agents for the Applicants

By _____
Kendrick Lo
Reg. No. 54,948
(416) 364-7311